

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

No. 41670

SHELL CHEMICAL COMPANY and SHELL OIL COMPANY

v.

BOSTON & MAINE CORPORATION, *ET AL.*

Decision No. 21

Decided: August 18, 1997

In Decision No. 19 (served June 26, 1997), we resolved most of the discovery matters then at issue in this proceeding but were unable to completely resolve two such matters (the Anderson/Giles/Karn matter and the McKinsey matter) that were disputed by complainants Shell Chemical Company and Shell Oil Company, on the one side, and defendant CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT), on the other side. The Anderson/Giles/Karn matter remains in dispute, and is therefore addressed in this decision. The McKinsey matter is not addressed in this decision; it has been resolved by the parties.¹

BACKGROUND

Decision No. 19. In Decision No. 19, we noted that we were troubled by an apparent discrepancy in the pleadings filed by complainants, on the one hand, and by defendants, on the other hand.² Defendants, in their pleading filed April 23, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 4/23/97 pleading), stated that CSXT had produced, among other documents, “documents of” John Anderson, J. E. Giles, and Richard L. Karn. Thereafter, complainants, in their pleading filed May 15, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 5/15/97 pleading), stated that CSXT had “produced not a single document . . . from the files of” John G. Anderson,³ J. E. Giles, and Richard L. Karn. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 8. We directed the parties to resolve this apparent discrepancy in accordance with the procedural schedule set out in Decision No. 19, slip op. at 9 (ordering paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9). That schedule provided: that complainants were to file, by July 3, 1997, a statement either affirming or retracting their allegation that CSXT had “produced not a single document . . . from the files of” Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn; that, if complainants affirmed that allegation in whole or in part, CSXT was to file, by July 10, 1997,

¹ In Decision No. 19, slip op. at 9 (ordering paragraphs 3 and 4), we ordered: that CSXT would have until July 3, 1997, either (i) to produce to complainants the pricing manual (or a redacted version thereof) that preceded the 350-page pricing manual which was the product of the McKinsey Study, or (ii) to file with the Board objections to such production; and that, if CSXT either produced a redacted version or filed objections, complainants would have until July 10, 1997, to file a motion to compel. On July 3, 1997, CSXT filed its “notification of compliance,” stating that it had that day produced to complainants a copy of a prior version of the 1996 CSXT Pricing Tool Kit. Because complainants have not filed a motion to compel, we have no occasion to further address the McKinsey matter.

² The pleadings at issue in Decision No. 19 that were filed by “defendants” were filed by most (though not all) of the 22 then-remaining defendants. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 1-2 (listing the 22 then-remaining defendants). The pleadings referenced in this decision as having been filed by defendant CSXT were filed by CSXT alone.

³ The “John G. Anderson” referenced in Decision No. 19, slip op. at 8 (line 12), is apparently “John *Q.* Anderson” (italics added to emphasize that Mr. Anderson's middle initial is “Q”).

either (a) a statement acknowledging that the allegation, to the extent affirmed, was factually accurate, or (b) copies of any documents it had theretofore provided to complainants that, in its opinion, demonstrated that the allegation, to the extent affirmed, was factually inaccurate; that complainants could file, by July 17, 1997, a reply; and that CSXT could file, by July 24, 1997, a rebuttal.

Complainants' 6/30/97 Pleading. By pleading filed June 30, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 6/30/97 pleading), complainants have “reaffirm[ed]” that they have identified no document as having been “produced from” or as having “come from” the files of John Q. Anderson, J. E. Giles, or Richard L. Karn.

CSXT's 7/10/97 Pleading. By pleading filed July 10, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 7/10/97 pleading), CSXT has submitted (under seal) copies of documents previously produced to complainants “which indicate on their face that they were generated and/or reviewed by Messrs. Giles and Karn,” *see* the 7/10/97 pleading at 1.⁴ CSXT adds that Messrs. Anderson and Giles do not maintain files of documents concerning the production, marketing, transportation, or pricing of polyethylene terephthalate (PET, the commodity at issue in this proceeding). CSXT has also reaffirmed its “prior representations that it has made a full search for any responsive documents that may have been in the possession of” Mr. Anderson, Mr. Giles, and/or Mr. Karn. *See* the 7/10/97 pleading at 1-2.

Complainants' 7/17/97 Pleading. By pleading filed July 17, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 7/17/97 pleading), complainants insist: that Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn still have not answered complainants' first set of interrogatories;⁵ and that no documents from “their files,” *see* the 7/17/97 pleading at 5, have been produced in response to complainants' first set of interrogatories. Complainants therefore request that we direct Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn to respond to complainants' first set of interrogatories.⁶

CSXT's 7/24/97 Pleading. By pleading filed July 24, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the 7/24/97 pleading), CSXT, urging the denial of complainants' 7/17/97 request, reaffirms yet again that it “has conducted a thorough search in response to Complainants' discovery requests and has produced (or is in the process of producing) all responsive documents.” *See* the 7/27/97 pleading at 4.⁷

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

THE ANDERSON/GILES/KARN MATTER. Having reviewed the pleadings filed in response to Decision No. 19, it now appears that the discrepancy we noted in Decision No. 19 largely revolves around semantics. CSXT personnel maintain files that can variously be described as office files and personal files. *Office files*, as we are using the term, are files maintained by a

⁴ In the appendix to this decision, we have undertaken to list the documents submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading.

⁵ These are the interrogatories that were submitted to defendants on March 1, 1996. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 3.

⁶ As previously noted, defendants (including CSXT) answered most of complainants' interrogatories by producing documents said to be responsive thereto. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 4.

⁷ CSXT notes: that, on July 3, 1997, complainants served supplemental interrogatories on CSXT; and that, on July 18, 1997, CSXT served its responses to these supplemental interrogatories. *See* the 7/24/97 pleading at 4 n.4. It is not entirely clear, however, that the responsive documents that CSXT is now “in the process of producing,” *see* the 7/24/97 pleading at 4, are documents responsive to the supplemental interrogatories.

particular "office"; the papers collected in these files are papers drafted or received by, or otherwise of interest to, the persons assigned to that office; and these files would not, in common usage, be considered the personal files of any particular individual. *Personal files*, as we are using the term, are files maintained by a particular individual; the papers collected in any set of personal files are papers drafted or received by, or otherwise of interest to, a particular individual; and any particular set of personal files will commonly be regarded as being, in some sense, the personal property of a particular individual (although, as a technical matter, it may be the company, and not the particular individual, that has legally recognized property rights in the papers collected in the so-called "personal" files).⁸

CSXT, in preparing its responses to complainants' first set of interrogatories, collected responsive documents both from office files and from personal files. As a practical matter, however: most of the documents thus collected by CSXT apparently came from office files; fewer such documents were collected by CSXT from personal files; and the documents collected by CSXT were not labeled in a manner that would have allowed for quick identification of the files from which such documents had been collected.

When defendants said, in their 4/23/97 pleading, that CSXT had produced "documents of" Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn, what defendants apparently meant to say was that CSXT had produced documents that were in some way connected to these men. When complainants said, in their 5/15/97 pleading, that CSXT had produced no documents from the files of Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn, complainants apparently meant to say: that, as far as they could tell, not even one document produced by CSXT clearly indicated that it had been collected from the personal files of Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and/or Karn; and that CSXT had not otherwise identified even one such document as having been collected from the personal files of Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and/or Karn. In light of this background, we now address the status of each of the three CSXT employees.

Re: Anderson. As noted in the appendix to this decision, and as conceded by CSXT in its 7/10/97 pleading (at 5), it appears that CSXT produced no documents authored or received by, or in any way connected to, Mr. Anderson. Although we accept CSXT's entirely plausible explanation for this lack of production,⁹ we note that defendants' 4/23/97 statement that CSXT had produced "documents of" Mr. Anderson may not be technically correct. Nevertheless, as any such inaccuracy does not appear to have prejudiced complainants, we will not pursue the Anderson matter further.

Re: Giles. As noted in the appendix to this decision, CSXT's 7/10/97 pleading demonstrates that CSXT had produced four memos explicitly connected to Mr. Giles (by which we mean that each such memo is either from or to, or is copied to, either "John E. Giles," "J. E. Giles," or "Giles"). CSXT concedes that these memos were not produced "from the files of" Mr. Giles, but CSXT notes that these memos *were* produced (apparently from office files maintained by persons other than Mr. Giles) and CSXT insists that there simply are no responsive documents in Mr. Giles' possession. We accept CSXT's entirely plausible representation that the few Giles-related memos included with CSXT's 7/10/97 pleading are the only Giles-related documents responsive to complainants' interrogatories. Thus, we will not pursue the Giles matter further.

Re: Karn. As noted in the appendix to this decision, CSXT's 7/10/97 pleading demonstrates that CSXT had produced 125 memos explicitly connected to Mr. Karn (by which we

⁸ A similar distinction is applicable to electronic files maintained on computers. Files maintained on an organization's "server" are office files; files maintained on an individual's "personal computer" are personal files.

⁹ CSXT indicates that there are simply no responsive documents in the possession of Mr. Anderson. This, CSXT adds, is not surprising, in that Mr. Anderson did not assume his position at CSXT until several months after complainants filed their complaint in this proceeding. *See* CSXT's 7/10/97 pleading at 5.

mean that each such memo is either from or to, or is copied to, or otherwise references, either “Rich Karn,” “RICH KARN,” “RL KARN,” “RLKARN,” “R. L. Karn,” “KARN,” or “KARN, RICH”). It may well be, though this is not entirely certain, that some of these memos are “from the files of” Mr. Karn. *See* CSXT's 7/10/97 pleading at 4 (documents authored or received by Mr. Karn were “for the most part” in files maintained by another CSXT employee; but at least some such documents were apparently in the possession of Mr. Karn). In any event, as we have no reason to believe that CSXT has not produced all documents involving Mr. Karn, we will not pursue the Karn matter further.

COMPLAINANT'S 7/17/97 REQUEST. In Decision No. 19, we addressed, among other things, complainants' request, presented in their “second motion to compel” filed April 3, 1997, that defendants be ordered to supplement their responses to complainants' first set of interrogatories by providing comprehensive and accurate responses thereto, by which (we noted) complainants had in mind the identification or production of responsive documents contained in the files of 39 named CSXT officers and employees. We denied this request because we accepted defendants' representations: that CSXT had made a good faith inquiry of all persons identified by complainants to assure that all responsive documents had been produced; that CSXT had produced all responsive documents that its inquiries had disclosed; and that there were no further documents that should be produced by CSXT. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 7-8.¹⁰

For essentially the same reasons, we will deny complainants' 7/17/97 request that Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn be directed to respond to complainants' first set of interrogatories. We accept CSXT's representations contained in its 7/10/97 and 7/24/97 pleadings: that CSXT has made a full search for any responsive documents that might have been in the possession of Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and/or Karn; that any such documents have been produced to complainants; and that Messrs. Anderson and Giles simply do not maintain files of documents concerning the production, marketing, transportation, or pricing of PET. Because these representations are entirely plausible, we see no justification for questioning their factual accuracy on the basis of the information now available to us.¹¹

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS. In Decision No. 19, we directed the parties to submit, in addition to the usual paper copies of all pleadings, electronic copies of all textual materials, workpapers, data bases, and spreadsheets. *See* Decision No. 19, slip op. at 9 & n.34. We are now making two technical changes in the directions respecting electronic submissions.

(1) In Decision No. 19, we indicated that electronic submissions were to be on 3.5-inch IBM-compatible floppy diskettes, QIC-80 tapes (in uncompressed form), or compact discs. We have recently become aware that QIC-80 tapes may not be fully compatible with our computers. Accordingly, we are now asking that electronic submissions be on either: (i) 3.5-inch IBM-compatible floppy diskettes; or (ii) compact discs.

¹⁰ Although we generally accepted CSXT's representations, we required the parties to make further submissions respecting the Anderson/Giles/Karn matter in view of the apparent discrepancy in the statements made by complainants, on the hand, and by defendants, on the other hand, respecting the production of documents of, or from the files of, Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn.

¹¹ In their Status Report on Discovery filed August 1, 1997, defendants state that complainants have sought depositions of Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn. We trust that CSXT will be cooperative with respect to complainants' efforts to depose Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn.

(2) In Decision No. 19, we indicated that electronic spreadsheets were to be in Lotus 1-2-3 Release 5. Because we have upgraded our computer capabilities, we are now asking that electronic spreadsheets be in, or convertible by, Lotus 1-2-3 97 Edition.¹²

Except as indicated in the two preceding paragraphs, the electronic submission requirements applicable to this proceeding remain as stated in Decision No. 19, slip op. at 9 & n.34.¹³

This action will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or the conservation of energy resources.

It is ordered:

1. The two discovery matters not completely resolved in Decision No. 19 (the Anderson/Giles/Karn matter and the McKinsey matter) are resolved in the manner indicated in this decision.

2. Complainant's 7/17/97 request that Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and Karn be directed to respond to complainants' first set of interrogatories is denied.

3. The parties shall submit all pleadings both in the required paper form and also as computer data contained on diskettes or compact discs.

4. This decision is effective on its service date.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan and Vice Chairman Owen.

Vernon A. Williams
Secretary

¹² Any party wishing to submit spreadsheets in formats other than Lotus 1-2-3 97 Edition should consult with our staff regarding such submissions. Some (though not all) spreadsheets prepared in other formats, though perhaps not convertible by Lotus 1-2-3 97 Edition, may nevertheless be useable by our staff. For further information, contact Paul H. Markoff, (202) 565-1625.

¹³ The electronic submission requirements set forth in Decision No. 19, and modified in this decision, supersede, for the purposes of this proceeding, the otherwise applicable electronic submission requirements set forth in our regulations. *See* 49 CFR 1104.3(a), as amended in *Expedited Procedures for Processing Rail Rate Reasonableness, Exemption and Revocation Proceedings*, STB Ex Parte No. 527, 61 FR 52710, 52711 (Oct. 8, 1996), 61 FR 58490, 58491 (Nov. 15, 1996).

APPENDIX

We have compiled, in this appendix, a list of the (by our count) 198 pages submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading. With very few exceptions, each page amounts to a single document.

Our list consists of two columns, each with 198 entries. Each entry in the left column is the “Bates Number” of a particular page.¹⁴ Each entry in the right column is our description of the material contained on that particular page. Each description in our list is in terms of the connection of the material to Messrs. Anderson, Giles, and/or Karn; and each such description in our list has reference only to the Anderson/Giles/Karn matter discussed in Decision No. 19.¹⁵

As used in this list, the term “memo” means a document that is in the nature of a memo, a note, a letter, an e-mail print-out, etc.

By our count, of the 198 pages submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading, there appear to be no references of any sort to Mr. Anderson.

By our count, of the 198 pages submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading, there are four memos that are explicitly connected to Mr. Giles (each such memo is either from or to, or is copied to, either “John E. Giles,” “J. E. Giles,” or “Giles”).

By our count, of the 198 pages submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading, there are 125 memos that are explicitly connected to Mr. Karn (each such memo is either from or to, or is copied to, or otherwise references, either “Rich Karn,” “RICH KARN,” “RL KARN,” “RLKARN,” “R. L. Karn,” “KARN,” or “KARN, RICH”).¹⁶

Here is our list:

CSX000450 cover sheet for CSX000451-454
 CSX000451 memo from “Rich Karn”
 CSX000452 memo to “Rich”
 CSX000453 memo from “Rich Karn”
 CSX000454 memo to “Rich”
 CSX000455 cover sheet for CSX000456-459
 CSX000456 memo from “Rich”
 CSX000457 memo to “Rich”

¹⁴ We think it best to note that the actual Bates Numbers stamped on the documents identified in our list as CSX004859, CSX004860, CSX004861, CSX004864, CSX004865, CSX004866, CSX004867, CSX004868, CSX004869, and CSX004870 are CSX04859, CSX04860, etc. (i.e., the Bates Numbers used throughout our list are 6-digit numbers, the first two digits of which are “00”; the Bates Numbers actually stamped on the documents submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading, and identified in our list as CSX004859, CSX004860, etc., are 5-digit numbers, only the first digit of which is a “0”; and we have added an extra “0” to the Bates Numbers representing these documents to simplify the appearance of our list, because, excepting only the documents identified in our list as CSX004859, CSX004860, etc., the Bates Numbers actually stamped on the documents submitted by CSXT with its 7/10/97 pleading are the 6-digit numbers used throughout our list).

¹⁵ We have not attempted to describe this material in terms of its relationship to the “merits” issues of market dominance and rate reasonableness.

¹⁶ This count does not include the many memos that are either from or to “Rich.”

CSX000458 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000459 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000465 memo from/to other persons¹⁷
 CSX000466 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000467 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000468 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000469 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000470 memo to "RICH KARN"
 CSX000471 document referencing "KARN"
 CSX000472 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000473 calculations of some sort
 CSX000806 memo copied to "RL KARN"
 CSX000807 memo to "RLKARN"
 CSX000808 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000809 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000810 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000814 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000815 calculations of some sort
 CSX000862 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000863 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000864 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000865 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000866 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000868 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000870 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000871 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000872 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000874 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000875 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000876 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000877 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000878 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000879 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000880 second page of CSX000879 memo
 CSX000881 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000882 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000883 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000884 second page of CSX000883 memo
 CSX000885 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000886 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000887 second page of CSX000886 memo
 CSX000888 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000889 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000890 memo from "Ricardo"
 CSX000891 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000892 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000893 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000894 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000895 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000896 memo from "Ricardo"
 CSX000897 memo from "RL KARN"

¹⁷ A memo that gives no indication that it was from or to, or that it was copied to, or that it contains a reference to, either Mr. Anderson, Mr. Giles, or Mr. Karn, is described in our list as a memo "from/to other persons."

CSX000898 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000899 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000900 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000901 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000902 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000903 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000904 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000905 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000906 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000907 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000908 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000909 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000910 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000911 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000912 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000913 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000914 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000915 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000916 memo copied to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000917 second page of CSX000916 memo
 CSX000918 memo copied to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000919 second page of CSX000918 memo
 CSX000920 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000921 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000922 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000923 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000924 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000925 second page of CSX000924 memo
 CSX000928 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000929 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000930 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000931 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000932 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000933 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000934 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000935 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000936 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000937 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000938 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000939 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000940 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000941 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000942 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000943 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000944 second page of CSX000943 memo
 CSX000945 memo copied to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000946 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000947 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000948 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000949 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000950 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000951 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000952 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000953 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000954 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000955 memo to "Rich"

CSX000956 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000957 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000958 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000959 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000960 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000961 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000962 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000963 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000964 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000965 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000966 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000967 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000968 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000969 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000970 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000971 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000972 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000973 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000974 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000975 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000976 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000977 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000978 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000979 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000980 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000981 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000982 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000983 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000984 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000985 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000986 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000987 memo from/to other persons
 CSX000988 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000989 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX000990 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000991 memo from "Rich"
 CSX000992 memo to "Rich"
 CSX000993 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000994 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000995 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX000996 memo to "RL KARN"
 CSX000997 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX000998 memo copied to "R. L. Karn"
 CSX000999 second page of CSX000998 memo
 CSX001000 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX001001 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX001002 memo from/to other persons
 CSX001003 memo from "RL KARN"
 CSX001004 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX001005 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX001006 memo to "Rich"
 CSX001007 memo from "Rich Karn"
 CSX001008 memo copied to "Rich Karn"
 CSX001009 memo to "Rich"
 CSX001010 memo to "KARN, RICH"
 CSX001011 memo from "Rich Karn"

CSX001012 memo referencing "R. L. Karn"
CSX001013 memo from "Rich"
CSX001014 memo from "Rich Karn"
CSX001015 memo from "Rich"
CSX001016 memo from "Rich Karn"
CSX001017 memo to "RL KARN"
CSX001018 memo from/to other persons
CSX001019 memo copied to "R. L. Karn"
CSX001020 schedule of some sort
CSX001021 memo to "Rich"
CSX001022 second page of CSX001021 memo
CSX001023 memo to "RL KARN"
CSX001029 memo mentioning "Rich Karn"
CSX001030 memo from "Rich K."
CSX001031 memo from "Rich Karn"
CSX001036 memo to "RL KARN"
CSX001040 memo to "RL KARN"
CSX004859 memo from "John E. Giles"
CSX004860 memo copied to "J. E. Giles"
CSX004861 second page of CSX004860 memo
CSX004864 memo to "John"
CSX004865 memo from/to other persons¹⁸
CSX004866 second page of CSX004865 memo
CSX004867 third page of CSX004865 memo
CSX004868 memo copied to "Giles"
CSX004869 memo to "J.E. Giles"
CSX004870 second page of CSX004869 memo

¹⁸ The CSX004865 memo, although from/to other persons and not explicitly copied to J. E. Giles, is clearly related to the CSX004868 memo, and, given the context, it seems reasonable to assume that the CSX004865 memo is somehow connected to J. E. Giles.